

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-19 are canceled. Claims 20-38 are pending. Claim 38 is amended.

### **Claim Objections**

Claim 38 is objected to because it refers to a non-existent Claim 39. Claim 38 has been amended to correct the issue.

### **Claim Rejections – 35 USC 103**

Claims 20-23 and 30-32 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baumgarten (U.S. Patent 4,118,162), hereinafter referred to as Baumgarten.

Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner did not provide a *prima facie* case of obviousness because less than all the elements of the Applicant's invention have been accounted for.

Independent Claims 20 and 30 of the present application both describe vulcanizing the reinforced hose-shaped structures after they have been stripped from the mandrels. In contradistinction, Baumgarten vulcanizes the hoses prior to removing the mandrels from them. As best understood, the Examiner has not accounted for this aspect of the Applicant's claimed invention and therefore has not formed a complete *prima facie* obviousness rejection. Applicant therefore believes that independent Claims 20 and 30 are in a condition for allowance.

Claims 22-23 and 31-32 depend either directly or indirectly from Claims 20 and 30 and are therefore believed to be in a condition for allowance for at least the same reason as Claims 20 and 30.

Claim 24 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baumgarten (U.S. Patent 4,118,162), hereinafter referred to as Baumgarten, and further in view of Takubo et al. (US Patent 4,863,653), hereinafter referred to as

Takubo.

Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. As stated above in response to the rejection of independent Claims 20 and 30, Baumgartner, as modified by the Examiner, does not provide all of the elements of independent Claims 20 and 30. As best understood, Takubo does not make up for the shortcoming of the Baumgartner as a reference and the Examiner's modification of Baumgartner.

Since Claim 24 depends either directly or indirectly from Claim 20, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 24 in a condition for allowance for at least the same reason as Claim 20.

Claims 25-27 and 34-38 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baumgarten as applied to Claims 20-23 and 30-32 above, and further in view of Reynolds et al. (U.S. Patent 6,620,475), Lietz (U.S. Patent 6,508,972), and LaSalle et al. (U.S. Patent 4,197,071).

Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. As stated above in response to the rejection of independent Claims 20 and 30, Baumgartner, as modified by the Examiner, does not provide all of the elements of independent Claims 20 and 30. As best understood, Reynolds, Lietz, and LaSalle also do not make up for the shortcoming of Baumgartner as a reference and the Examiner's modification of Baumgartner.

Since Claims 25-27 and 34-38 depend either directly or indirectly from Claims 20 and 30, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 25-27 and 34-38 are in a condition for allowance for at least the same reasons as Claims 20 and 30.

Claims 28-29 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baumgarten, Lietz, Reynolds, and LaSalle as applied to Claims 20-27 above, and further in view of Masse (Netherlands Patent Application NL 1019773 and Netherlands Patent Application 1020109 – of which US Patent Application 2005/0144998A1 was used as an English translation).

Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. As stated above in response to the rejection of independent Claims 20 and 30, Baumgartner, as modified by the Examiner, does not provide all of the elements of independent Claims 20 and 30. As

best understood, Reynolds, Lietz, and LaSalle also do not make up for the shortcoming of Baumgartner as a reference and the Examiner's modification of Baumgartner.

Since Claims 28-29 depend either directly or indirectly from Claim 20, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 28-29 are in a condition for allowance for at least the same reason as Claim 20.

## **CONCLUSION**

Accordingly, Applicant believes that the claims as amended overcome the raised objections and rejections and are in a condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

/Edwin W. Bacon, Jr./

---

Edwin W. Bacon, Jr.  
Registration No. 39,098  
Continental Teves, Inc.  
One Continental Drive  
Auburn Hills, MI 48326  
(248) 393-6405  
Attorney for Applicants